

### III. REMARKS

The amendment filed 16 September 2005 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure.

Claims 1-5, 8-22, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Since the language added to claims 1 and 26 is now being deleted, the above objection and rejection are now moot.

Claims 1-5, and 8-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wang.

Claims 1 and 26 have been amended so as to specify that the "another party" or "wireless access device" is able to determine without a connection to a central control element whether the key is valid. This amendment is based, in particular on the paragraph bridging pages 11 and 12 of the description. This feature is not disclosed in Wang, and further, the Examiner has indicated at section 6 of the office action that in Wang the door receives validity information through the hotel's server (which could be cable connected to the internet). The server is not "another party" or a "wireless access device".

Claim 23 specifies the provision of the key with time related information specifying a time period for which said

key is valid, which in the described embodiment allows an electronic door lock to determine without any connection to a central control element whether or not access should be provided. The Examiner has cited column 11, lines 49 to 53, of Wang against claim 23, but this section of Wang relates to the operation of an approval button to signify approval of a proposed transaction, and how a transaction request may be understood as not being approved if the approve button is not activated within a given period of time after receiving the request. It is submitted that no part of this section is a "key" for providing access, and, in any case, there is no disclosure of providing time information specifying a time period for which an access key is valid. In the above-mentioned section of Wang, the time period is that in which an approve button needs to be activated; NOT a time period for which an access key is valid. Furthermore, it is submitted that this section of Wang does not disclose the feature of the time information being provided with the key via a wireless link.

Claim 1 recites that another party can determine without any connection to a central control element whether or not to provide access. Claim 26 recites similar limitations for the wireless access device. Claim 23 recites specifying a time period for which a key is valid.

Since none of these limitations are in Wang, the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102 should be withdrawn.

Further, since Wang does not suggest these limitations, these claims, as well as their dependent claims, are unobvious over it.



For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Henry I. Steckler  
Henry I. Steckler  
Reg. No. 24,139

Feb. 27, 2006  
Date

Perman & Green, LLP  
425 Post Road  
Fairfield, CT 06824  
(203) 259-1800  
Customer No.: 2512

#### CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date indicated below as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 27 Feb 2006

Signature: [Signature]  
Person Making Deposit